DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 468 95 SP 013 336

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | HIP-An Alternative Program for the Preparation of Elementary Teachers. |
| INSTITUTION | Missouri Univ., Columbia. Coll. of Education. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | Nov 78 |
| NOTE | 30p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Education; *Field Experience Programs; *Humanistic Education; *Individualized Programs; Personal Growth; *Preservice Education; *Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Role Models; Student Teaching; Teacher Aides; Teacher Education |
| IDENTIFIERS | Early Field Experience |

ABSTRACT

The HIP (Humanizing, Individualizing, Personalizing) program at the University of Missouri-Columbia was designed to meet demands of teacher educators, students, and school practitioners for earlier, expanded field experiences and for more direct linkage between basic theory and pedagogic practice. Certain basic assumptions are made in this program. Instructional approaches must be tailored to individual differences and learning paces. It is felt that students in preservice training should be given opportunities to model teaching behaviors exemplified by their own teachers. Supportive interpersonal relationships among students, cooperating teachers, and college supervisors are emphasized. A more direct linkage between basic theory and actual practice through classroom practice is sought. Participants in the program consider themselves members of a learning community with constant interaction and mutual decision making. The basic academic curriculum for the program is appended to this report along with evaluative statements from its participants. (JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED164468

# HIP - AN ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM

# FOR THE PREPARATION OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

SUBMITTED TO

AACTE

DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT AWARD PROGRAM

SUBMITTED BY

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bob G. Woods

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

BOB G. WOODS

DEAN

NOVEMBER 1978



SP013336

HIP--AN ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM

FOR THE PREPARATION OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

University of Missouri-Columbia

## I. Summary of Program

The HIP program at the University of Missouri-Columbia represents an alternative form of pre-service preparation for elementary school teachers. This program, now in its fifth year, was designed to meet the demands of teacher-educators, students, and school practitioners for earlier, expanded field experiences and for a more direct linkage between basic theory and pedagogic practice. Essential component elements of the program include: (1) extended field experiences in varied school settings; (2) more direct integration of professional coursework with field experiences; (3) close interpersonal relationships among students, faculty, and cooperating teachers; (4) direct advisor supervision of advisees' practica; (5) a decision making structure involving shared participation by students and public school teachers as well as university faculty; (6) follow-up seminars for program graduates; and (7) multiple evaluation procedures for assessing on-going program effectiveness.

Basic to the HIP ("Humanizing, Individualizing, Personalizing") program are the following assumptions: first, that instructional approaches must be tailored to individual differences rather than requiring all prospective teachers to learn in the same way and at the same pace; secondly, that students in pre-service training should be afforded opportunities to model teaching behaviors exemplified by their own teachers; and thirdly, that such human attributes as empathy, understanding, cooperativeness, and the ability to communicate effectively are important to teaching success, and should be nurtured through warm, supportive interpersonal relationships among all participants throughout the total pre-service training process.

All program participants--faculty, students, cooperating teachers and public school supervisory personnel--are volunteers. Entering students, together with faculty, form a Learning Community and function in an open-space university classroom. Community members together identify instructional goals to be emphasized, practice a division of labor in planning and managing activities, and cooperatively analyze outcomes for purposes of subsequent improvement. Classes are organized in terms of three 16-semester-hour "blocks", each of which correlates instructional didactics with a field experience. Currently, participating students represent approximately one-third of all elementary education majors within the College. Exclusive of outside support personnel, twenty-one faculty members are involved in the HIP program.

One indication of the program's success is the public schools' preference for students participating as classroom aides. There is also a strong employment demand for HIP graduates.

## II. COMPREHENSIVE EXPLANATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRAM

### A. Description and Development of the Program

The pervasive mood among many schoolmen in the early 1970's was one of bafflement and confusion. Throughout the decade preceding, schooling in America had been under more or less continuous assault. This new brand of educational criticism in the Sixties-some of it vituperative and oftentimes abusive-was almost unprecedented in its ferocity. Schools were assailed by critics for being joyless prisons, inhumane, alienating, and profoundly miseducative. Teachers, it was claimed, were guilty of stifling curiosity, discouraging creativity, and in general suppressing children's natural desire for learning. The litany of complaints seemed endless. At the root of the problem, the argument ran, was the syndrome of "mindlessness"--an ineluctable and persistent failure on the part of an uncaring educational Establishment to think through what made for tr ly effective instruction and meaningful learning.

Coming hard on the heels of an era when schools had been criticized for rapid curricula, anemic standards, and neglect of basics, the humanistic critique of institutionalized education left many people bewildered. Fundamental changes did indeed seem called for, but it was by no means clear what shape future reforms would assume. For some, the call of deschoolers to abandon formal schooling altogether offered a certain plausibility. For others, the answer seemed to lie with "open education," with open-space classrooms, individualized curricula, and new pedagogical techniques emphasizing auto-tutorial and small-group instruction.

In 1974 the United States Office of Education enunciated as one of its major thrusts the promotion of "changes in teacher training institutions which will prepare teachers better to promote positive growth and development in young people and to intervene in self and socially destructive behavior in

young people." In other words, one partial answer to alienation and social fragmentation lay with a type of schooling more properly appreciative of individual differences, affective growth, and the need for positive self-images among young people. Basic educational change in turn would require a new breed of teachers--and teacher-educators--more fully responsive to these imperatives.

During this same period faculty representatives of the College of Education at the University of Missouri began meeting with members of the Columbia Public School District to discuss the possibilities of creating an alternative program for the preparation of elementary teachers. Eventually a special committee was formed to plan and implement a program based on a model adapted in part from the Charles F. Kettering Foundation's I D E A (Institute for the Development of Educational Activities) Change Program for Individually Guided Education (IGE). The basic goal was to develop a truly "humanistic" teacher education program.

At the very outset it was agreed that all participants in the new program--faculty, students, and public school personnel--would have to work together cooperatively to insure its success. Moreover, it was felt essential that all persons involved would have to be volunteers; coercion had no place in the type of program contemplated.

There followed a series of special retreats and workshops during which the outlines of the program and its unique features gradually took shape. Early in the planning process, a set of "We Agree" statements, which still serve as program guidelines, was formulated and adopted (cf Appendix A).

Briefly, the basic structure of the new HIP ("Humanizing, Individualizing, Personalizing") program is a Learning Community. Its members include students, faculty, public school supervisory personnel, and cooperating teachers from the

local Columbia school district. Virtually all decisions regarding basic objectives to be emphasized, all planning and assessment functions, and instructional work, take place within the Community. Insofar as possible, all decisions on a given issue are arrived at through a process of open discussion until an operational consensus is achieved. All members of the Community are actively involved. Only essential administrative and logistical questions are decided upon by the program's director.

HIP instruction is offered in three 16-semester-hour blocks, which are normally taken over a three-year period. Participating students spend approximately one-third of each class day working as an aide in an elementary school. When not on field assignments, students concentrate on the specific set of content areas offered in the classes organized for each block. Block I emphasizes methods courses in educational psychology, literature, science, physical education, and reading; Block II, methods courses in language arts, social sciences, mathematics, music, art, and psychology; and Block III is organized in measurement and evaluation, educational foundations, organization and administration, and physical education. All academic areas required in the regular elementary teacher preparation program plus several specialized areas are represented within the HIP Learning Community. Previously existing courses were not simply transferred to HIP; each was re-worked extensively to emphasize small-group discussion, individual projects, alternative grading options, and self-paced learning. In Block III, concentrated coursework occupies one-half of the semester; student teaching takes up the remaining half.

In order to maximize flexibility in program planning, the basic HIP design calls for Blocks I and II to be repeated for two semesters and for Block II to be offered again the following two semesters. Students typically begin with Block I, but the design permits a student to enter Block II, providing previously

required courses have been completed under the regular organizational format. (cf Appendix B for a summary of the HIP organizational design.)

HIP stresses close working relationships between faculty advisors and student advisees. Each professor assumes primary responsibility for planning and guiding his or her advisees through a coursework pattern. The advisement function is made to serve as a natural extension of more conventional teacher-student relationships, but it also encompasses program planning and assessment, supervision of field experiences, and personal ccunseling. Advisors meet with their advisees weekly. Typically, more time is spent on reinforcing a close interpersonal relationship than on academics. Virtually all students are assigned their first or second choice for an advisor. Teacher-student interaction is also facilitated through social functions and periodic retreats sponsored by the overall Learning Community.

The HIP program has operated in an open-space classroom since its inception. In 1977, however, the program was re-located in an expanded and more attractive facility where all instruction is located, where Learning Community meetings are held as well as conferences, and where outside visitors can be entertained. The HIP facility is often used by participating students as a place for study and informal learning.

B. Objectives and Goals of the HIP Program

The overall objectives of HIP is to produce effective, self-confident elementary teachers, who, through an individualized field-based program emphasizing modeling, will have acquired the necessary knowledge and competencies to exercise leadership in the profession.

Consistent with this fundamental orientation, the HIP program is conceived, first, as a process for individualizing, personalizing, and humanizing learning

by tailoring instructional approaches to individual differences rather than requiring all prospective teachers to learn in the same way and at the same pace; and, secondly, as a process for continuous pre-service improvement, making it possible for prospective teachers to evaluate their own performances in a clinical context, to alter their classroom behavior where indicated, and to advance toward successively higher levels of effective teaching.

The HIP Learning Community takes its objectives seriously. Moving from more general to specific goals, there exists a consensus of opinion on the following propositions. The program:

--will promote and encourage self-direction in learning and continuous self-improvement in professional pre-service development;

--will attempt to foster in each participant positive feelings and attitudes toward self and others;

--will offer students in pre-service training numerous opportunities to both model and critique teaching behaviors exemplified by Learning Community faculty;

--will correlate didactics with daily field experiences as interdependent elements within the total teacher preparation process;

--will encourage the growth of close supportive relationships among all Learning Community members;

--will offer instruction reflecting the current "state of the art" in education, with particular emphasis upon affective learning (E.G., valuing, decision-making, communication, etc.);

--will integrate assessment data for purposes of monitoring the on-going effectiveness of the program and for suggesting improvements.

C. HIP Program Personnel

The success of any innovative alternative program such as HIP requires that all participants involved be enthusiastic supporters of its underlying philosophy and dedicated to its continuing success. Consequently, as mentioned earlier, all HIP personnel--students, faculty, cooperating teachers, and public

school supervisory persons--are volunteers. Faculty members representing the various elementary curricular areas form the core of the program's instructional design team. Each has benefited from continuing in-service education to assist in implementing the program and contributing to its on-going success. However, faculty membership in the HIP Learning Community is not restricted to those directly involved in instruction. Persons representing the Office of Education Field Experience, the Office of the Dean, and other departments within the College of Education at the University are likewise involved, in varying degrees. Moreover, public school personnel regularly serve as consultants, as participants in Community meetings, and as resource persons at special conferences and retreats.

The faculty presently includes the program director, six professors, five associate professors, three assistant professors, two instructors, and four graduate teaching assistants. External personnel providing special expertise and consultive services include deans, department chairpersons, other university faculty members, and practitioners from the surrounding public school systems.

The first group of students entering the program (Winter, 1975) was composed of 80 freshmen and sophomores interested in majoring in elementary education. Since that time, 25 to 30 students have been selected for the program each year. Applications are received once students have had an opportunity to review HIP and its objectives during their first course in professional education. Those accepted have been screened to determine the strength of their commitment and the likelihood of their being able to complete the program successfully. They have also met the admission criteria for a regular degree program in the College of Education. In addition, HIP candidates are required to interview and discuss their decision with a faculty and a student member of the Learning Community prior to acceptance into the program.

D. Budget

The initial HIP fiscal support came from two sources, a United States Office of Education (USOE) grant and the general operating budget of the College. The grant provided specified portions of the salaries of key project personnel but was used primarily for in-service clinical experiences. During concentrated workshops and faculty retreats, experienced facilitators acquainted interested faculty members with the decision-making processes involved in an individualized and humanistic teacher education program. Each year of the program the grant has covered travel expenses for at least two, and in some years three, faculty retreats. Some of the retreat grant funds were also used for special materials to assist the faculty Learning Community in humanizing and individualizing their teaching methods. In addition, the first follow-up seminar for the graduates of the program was funded jointly by the College and the grant. All other costs, including an open-space classroom, were absorbed by the salary and wages (S&W) and expense and equipment (E&E) budgets of the participating departments within the College.

The USOE funding has decreased each year of the program and was terminated at the close of the 1976-1977 school year. HIP expenses are now covered entirely by the College, including a part-time secretary and a small annual E&E operating budget of approximately $500. However, salaries of the faculty members in the Learning Community come out of the budgets of their respective departments within the College, and no extra compensation is received for participation in workshops or retreats or for service on various HIP committees.

E. The Contributions of HIP to the Improvement of Teacher Education

Aiding experiences are an integral part of the total HIP program design, and are heavily emphasized. In order to implement the objective of earlier,

expanded field experience directly correlated with basic theory, the Learning Community required that faculty-advisors who offer instruction also assume responsibility for the supervision of their advisees' classroom practica. Since HIP students are in a classroom working with children at the same time they are enrolled in methods courses, there are ample opportunities for them to relate basic theory to its practical applications, and vice versa. Under the current plan, student participants serve as classroom aides for at least two hours a day for one semester during the sophomore year and one semester during the junior year. Full-time student teaching is reserved for the senior year. Experience has shown that the often-repeated demand for more field experiences in a teacher education program is feasible without compromising its academic rigor, and, further, that it is both desirable and possible to integrate instruction in basic educational theory with opportunities to test such theory in practice. The overall impact of the HIP design is to encourage prospective teachers to see classroom pedagogy as a natural outgrowth of, and the "testing ground" for educational theory.

The HIP program also offers an instructive model for self-renewing change. Crucial to the success of this model is a clear, explicit statement of objectives to which all participants are committed. Of equal importance is the process of "open" decision-making and assessment whereby new innovations are tried out, proposed changes are tested and evaluated, and future programmatic emphases hammered out.

Thirdly, HIP offers a blueprint or exemplary model for democratic planning and shared authority. It represents a viable alternative to hierarchical administrative structures whereby vertical control emanates "from the top" and filters downward. On the contrary, the history of HIP demonstrates that teacher-educators, public school practitioners, administrators, and students can work together

cooperatively; that shared authority and responsibility are possible; and that despite differences in professional orientation or perspective, experience, and maturity, each group can make an effective contribution to the design and operation of a defensible teacher education program.

F. Evaluation Methods and Results

As is often the case with federally funded projects, external evaluation was made of the HIP program. ABT Associates, Inc., of Cambridge, Mass., evaluated HIP for the U. S. Office of Education and the results were extremely positive.

Perhaps, more significant because of their depth and scope, have been the self-evaluation studies which were conducted from the program's inception. The HIP program at the University of Missouri was well-conceived and well-designed, and included provisions for both formative and summative evaluation.

Early formative evaluation took the form of inquiries (questionnaires were used primarily) to students and faculty in the program. The data showed several areas that needed strengthening (especially student-advisee relationships and coordination between the work in college classes and the aiding in the classrooms). Improvements were made that strengthened the social interactions, the applicability of the didactic material and the relationships between the public schools and the other HIP Learning Community members.

Besides the informal, on-going evaluation of HIP, the Learning Community has carefully, systematically, gathered data regarding the impact of the HIP program on its students as well as on the educational community it serves.

The basic research methodology used was pre/post testing done on the HIP group and a comparable control group. Data were collected on a number of variables, the most interesting of which were self-concept and learning preference

measures. Follow-up studies were also planned (and are on-going). The follow-up studies provided data about the students' and their supervisor's attitudes toward the HIP program and their opinions about how well the program prepared elementary school teachers.

In one comparison study with a control group, the students in the HIP program showed statistically significant changes in the self-criticism score (indicating increased normality, healthy openness and capacity for self-criticism), in the self-satisfaction score (indicating greater satisfaction with the way the person sees himself/herself), in the personal self score, (reflecting the persons sense of personal worth and adequacy), and in the general maladjustment scale (indicating lower tendency to be classified as a psychiatric patient and more toward non-patient status). After five semesters in the program, the students were again post-tested. There were statistically significant pre/post test changes on 14 of the 17 scales. Many of these changes were highly significant, and all were in a positive or favorable direction.

During a retreat held on the UMC campus, graduates of the program were asked to critique the program from their perspective as graduates having opportunities to practice using what they learned. They were asked to indicate strengths and weaknesses and to make a special note of the kinds of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that they need in the teaching profession, which the HIP program did not help them to attain. These data were collected formally (through questionnaires) and informally (in small group discussions and one-to-one interchange). The findings were indeed rewarding and confirmed the information we had received from the public schools who hired these teachers: they are indeed better prepared than their counterparts in the regular teacher-education program. They also seemed to be more confident in their ability to teach. However, a number of the graduates felt a need for more training in

dealing with discipline problems. Classroom management, as a humane activity, seems to be an area needing more attention. (cf Appendix D)

Most recently, data are being collected on the present students' attitudes. Variables being investigated are: attitudes toward professors, attitudes toward elementary school students, attitudes toward teaching as a profession, attitudes toward elementary school teachers, and attitudes about themselves (self-concept, confidence as a teacher, etc.).

Based on the data currently available, HIP appears to be a relatively successful attempt to include in a single program workable adaptations of some of the most promising new thrusts in teacher education. It incorporates (to varying degrees) philosophies and concepts from the Individually Guided Education (IGE) and the Performance Based Teacher Education (PBTE) movements. It meets the demands of students and practitioners for earlier and expanded field experiences which are correlated more directly with classroom theory. It deals with such problems as drug abuse, sexism, and racism in the schools. It provides students with an awareness of the humanistic and career education movements. In addition, it serves as a mechanism to bring teacher educators and practitioners together in the decision-making process for the purpose of enhancing the educational experiences of all concerned: schoolchildren, college students in training, cooperating teachers, and teacher educators--a true symbiotic relationship.

## APPENDIX A

The set of "We Agree" statements, which serves as a guideline for HIP, was formulated and adopted by consensus of the Learning Community in the planning phase:

We Agree that human learning is personal, continuous, and occurs through a variety of learning modes and in different environments.

We Agree that the advisor-advisee relationship should focus on academic and personal concerns and be characterized by mutual openness and trust.

We Agree that the program should be flexible, a product of Learning Community interaction, and consistent with learning program goals.

We Agree that decisions affecting the Learning Community as a group are the responsibility of the Learning Community.

## APPENDIX B

### Professional Education Component

### Organizational Format of the HIP Program

**Block I**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A102 | Educational Psychology | 2 Hours |
| E196 | Literature in the Elementary School | 3 Hours |
| E198 | Science in the Elementary School | 2 Hours |
| H127 | Physical Education Activities in the Elementary School | 2 Hours |
| E325 | Teaching Reading in the Elementary School | 3 Hours |
| E190 | Experimental Education in the Elementary School | 4 Hours |
| | Total Hours | 16 Hours |

**Block II**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| E366 | Teaching Language Arts in the Elementary School | 2 Hours |
| E368 | Social Studies in the Elementary School | 3 Hours |
| E167 | Mathematics in the Elementary School | 2 Hours |
| J129 | Elementary School Music | 2 Hours |
| E118 | Art Activities in the Elementary School | 2 Hours |
| A360 | Topics in Educational Psychology: HIP Education | 2 Hours |
| E190 | Experimental Education in the Elementary School | 4 Hours |
| | Total Hours | 17 Hours |

**Block III**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A140 | Introduction to Educational Measurement and Evaluation | 2 Hours |
| B353 | Intellectual Foundations of Education | 3 Hours |
| C141 | School Organization and Administration for Elementary Teachers | 2 Hours |
| H360 | Topics in Health & Physical Education: HIP Education | 2 Hours |
| E199 | Student Teaching in the Elementary School | 8 Hours |
| | Total Hours | 17 Hours |

Professional Courses to be taken during NON-HIP semesters:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| H65 | Elements of Health Education | 2 Hours |
| L339 | Education of Exceptional Children | 3 Hours |

Organization of Block Offerings

| | 74-75 | | 75-76 | | 76-77 | | 77-78 | | 78-79 | | 79-80 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | W | F | W | F | W | F | W | F | W | F | W |
| Block I | | X | | X | | X | X | | | X | X | |
| Block II | | | X | | X | | | X | X | | | X |
| Block III | | | | | X | | X | | | X | X | |

Block I students represent the entering HIP students and are recruited from second semester freshmen and first semester sophomores. Only 25 to 35 students are accepted for each new group.

The Faculty of the HIP Learning Community are divided into three design teams to coordinate and integrate didactic material to be emphasized in each Block.

The following chart represents the basic design of the HIP program.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Drug Education | | | HIP Block I (One Semester First Year)<br>Integration of Field Experience & Didactics | Humanistic Education | Career Education |
| | Media Educ. | | | | |
| | | | HIP Block II (One Semester Second Year)<br>Integration of Field Experience & Didactics | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | HIP Block III (One Semester Third Year)<br>Integration of Field Experience & Didactics | | |

Note: For one academic year and the one semester preceding each HIP Block each student in the Learning Community will be enrolled in regular courses (general requirements) of the University outside of the College of Education in order to obtain general requirements.

## Appendix C

Results of the self-concept and learning preference factor research and testimonials from cooperating teachers are reported here so the reader may ascertain the extent to which the HIP program has reached its goals.

### Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Data

It was hypothesized that the HIP program would have a positive effect on participants' self-concepts as a result of the programmatic attempts to humanize, individualize, and personalize their training. To test this hypothesis, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) was administered at the beginning of the students' participation in the project, and readministered at the end of the first semester of training (winter 1975) and at the end of each succeeding year in the program. Data are reported for the first group enrolled in the program and include the pretest and posttest scores after one semester and after five semesters. Comparative data were collected for a control group of students enrolled in the conventional elementary teacher education program. On both the counseling and clinical forms of the TSCS, only those scales deemed meaningful in the context of the program were analyzed. Variability, distribution, and time scores on the counseling form were omitted as relatively meaningless for this investigation,

and net conflict scores on the clinical form were not analyzed since they seemed less meaningful than total conflict scores. The number of deviant signs score from the clinical form was also omitted from the analysis.

To determine whether there were initial differences in self-concept between the experimental (HIP) subjects and control subjects, t-tests for the differences between mean scores were calculated. Results indicated no statistically significant differences for any of the variables of interest; it was therefore concluded that the two groups were not different with regard to self-concept at the beginning of the study.

At the end of the fifth semester (or third year) of the program, analysis of the TSCS pre- and posttest data for the control group (n=29) indicated no statistically significant changes in mean scores for the 17 variables considered pertinent to this study. It would appear from these data that the conventional program had little or no effect on the self-concepts of participating students as measured by the TSCS.

HIP students' TSCS scores after one semester in the program showed statistically significant changes:

1. In the self-criticism score--indicating an increased normal, healthy openness and capacity for self-criticism ($t = 3.27$, $p$ less than .002)

2. In the self-satisfaction score--indicating greater satisfaction with the way the person sees himself/herself ($t = 1.96$, $p$ less than .05)

3. In the personal self score--reflecting the person's sense of personal worth and adequacy ($t = 2.25$, $p$ less than .03)

4. In the general maladjustment scale--indicating lower tendency to be classified as a psychiatric patient and more toward non-patient status ($t = 1.96$, $p$ less than .05)

After five semesters in the program, and taking into consideration only the 34 subjects for whom all data were available and who completed their teacher education program as of May, 1977, 14 of the 17 scales showed statistically significant pre-post test changes. Many of these changes were highly significant, and all were in a positive or favorable direction. On the counseling form, the following changes were noted:

1. A highly significant increase in the total positive score--the most important single score on the counseling form reflecting overall self-esteem and personal worth ($t = 5.59$, $p$ less than .0001)

2. Continued increase (from the first posttest) in openness and capacity for self-criticism ($t = 3.84$, $p$ less than .001)

3. Significant increases in all subscores of the total positive score: Identity--"What I Am" ($t = 4.05$, $p$ less than .0001); Self-Satisfaction--"How I Feel About Myself" ($t = 5.25$, $p$ less than .0001); and Behavior--"What I Do" or "How I Act" ($t = 4.04$, $p$ less than .0001)

4. An increase in the physical self score--the way the person views his/her body, state of health, physical appearance, skills, and sexuality ($t = 3.23$, $p$ less than .003)

5. A continued increase in the individual's sense of personal worth and adequacy ($t = 5.19$, $p$ less than .0001)

6. An increase in the family self score--indicating more positive feelings of adequacy, worth, and value as a family member ($t = 5.00$, $p$ less than .0001)

7. An increase in the social self score--the self as perceived in relation to others on the basis of social interaction ($t = 3.47$, $p$ less than .001)

On the clinical form, scores for the experimental (HIP) subjects showed statistically significant changes in the direction of less total conflict (less confusion, contradiction, and general conflict in self-perception) and less tendency toward general maladjustment, psychosis, neurosis, and personality disorder.

These data provide convincing evidence of steady improvement of the self-concepts for HIP participants and distinguish them from members of the control group who were trained in the conventional manner.

## Learning Preference Profile Data

As part of the initial testing of Group 1, the /I/D/E/A/ Learning Preference Profile was administered. The instrument was readministered at the end of the first semester (winter 1975) of the HIP program. Control data were obtained by pre- and posttesting (winter 1975 semester) sophomore elementary majors who had chosen not to enter the program.

The Learning Preference Profile solicits the subject's preferences from a large variety of learning modes under eight categorical factor headings: Evaluation Preference Factors, Motivational Preference Factors, Teacher Preference Factors, Reward Preference Factors, Activity Preference Factors, Media Preference Factors, Grouping Preference Factors, and Task Preference Factors. It was hypothesized that students who would opt for a program advertised as less structured and more flexible than the conventional program would prefer a wider variety of learning and assessment modes than those who would choose not to participate.

The data obtained from the pre- and posttesting of the experimental (HIP) and control groups were analyzed by converting all responses to percentages and testing the differences between percentages at the .05 level of confidence. Pretest data identified 16 factors preferred significantly more often by HIP students, while only 3 factors were preferred more often by the control group. Posttest data identified a total of 21 factors preferred by HIP students versus 7 preferred more often by the controls.

The Learning Preference Factors Summary (Figure 1) clearly indicates the greater preference of HIP students for a diversity of learning and motivational modes and evaluation methods.

Figure 1
LEARNING PREFERENCE FACTORS SUMMARY

| Pretest Differences | | Posttest Differences | |
|---|---|---|---|
| HIP/Control* | | HIP/Control* | |
| Project evaluation | | Observation (evaluation) | |
| Praise from teacher-publicly | | Project evaluation | |
| Listener | | Thinking about things | |
| Field trips | | Graduation credits | |
| Laboratory experiments | | Sense of accomplishment | |
| Tutoring | | Avid reader | |
| Periodicals | | Discussions-student led | |
| Phono records | | Field Trips | |
| Resource files | | Laboratory experiments | |
| Models | | Simulation | |
| Paired learning | | Periodicals | |
| Tutorial--teach another | | Phono records | |
| Independent--by oneself | | Resource files | |
| No preference (sex) | | Models | |
| No preference (age) | | Large groups/lectures, movies | |
| No Preference (structure) | | Small groups/3-10 | |
| | | Paired learning | |
| | | Independent--by oneself | |
| | | Problem of immediate concern | |
| | | No preference (age) | |
| | | Nonstructured | |
| Control/HIP* | | Control/HIP* | |
| Male (teachers) | | Standardized tests | |
| Under 40 (teachers) | | Take home/open book tests | |
| Structured | | Discussions--teacher led | |
| | | Nonsequential | |
| | | Problems of future concern | |
| | | Under 40 (age) | |
| | | Structured | |

*Note: HIP Control denotes those preferences which were chosen by HIP students significantly more often than by the control subjects. Control/HIP denotes those preferences which were chosen by the control subjects significantly more often than by HIP students.

Cooperating Teachers--Testimonials

Near the end of Block II (winter 1976 semester) cooperating teachers were asked to respond to three questions about their experience with the HIP aides assigned to their Learning Communities:

1. In comparison with other aides and student teachers you have had assigned to you, how would you rate HIP aides?

2. If differences are perceivable, to what would you attribute these differences?

3. In your opinion, how effective has the effort been to integrate course theory with classroom experience?

Sample responses to each queston convey the general tone of cooperating teachers' feelings about their experiences with the students participating in HIP.

Question 1: In comparison with other aides and student teachers you have had assigned to you, how would you rate HIP aides?

"I find there is a difference between HIP aides and other aides. One is that the HIP aides have a plan, something that they are working for, whereas some of the other aides I've had are just coming in to aide and receive credit; their background of experience hasn't been that much. They just seem to come in and grade papers. The HIP girls are here for a definite purpose. They know they are going to be teachers. They are coming in and trying to get everything they can out of it. This, of course, makes a difference in their attitudes and their own

personal motivation. This is quite evident in the projects they do, and they often ask me if I can let them incorporate their ideas into the classroom experience. I am flexible enough to say yes. As a result they get more experience by using their own ideas when working with the children. A lot of student teachers don't have that experience."

"I feel the HIP aides are really prepared to work in the classroom. I think probably the strongest point of the whole experience is their supervision. They know that whenever there is a problem there are at least two or three people they can go to. I hear them talking about their instructors and it is so different from when I was in school. We just didn't get to know our instructors or professors as well. I know there is more involvement in small groups, working on a one-to-one basis. So I know that when problems do arise they can go to their advisor, their instructors, or myself. Everyone is working together, which makes a big difference."

Question 2: If differences are perceivable, to what would you attribute these differences?

"By having field experiences early in the program, they are better able to see how their methods courses apply to real classroom situations. Also, having contact with a variety of children gives them a frame of reference as they learn about individual learning

and behavior patterns."

"Differences between the HIP aides and regular aides can be attributed to the fact that the HIP program is organized so that the student has gome direction in her own program. She is able to correlate her coursework with the work the children are doing in the classroom. Also, she avoids repetition and is better able to build experiences in various areas of coursework and classroom experience."

"Part, I'm sure, is the fact that they are in the classroom more. They are having more experiences with children. But you can't discount the fact of the personality, the selection of the students in the program, too. I guess I have to look back to even the first year. We felt that quite a few of our girls were superior. And they hadn't had that many more experiences than others we've had coming to us. Maybe it's the time span: the fact that they get to rotate and change and get all aspects of the day at an early point in their experiences."

"The setup of the program: getting involved as a freshman or sophomore rather than waiting until one's last semester. They are getting a full view of what goes on in the classroom by the time they are finished. It is much easier for them to go into the teaching field with this experience."

Question 3: In your opinion, how effective has the effort to integrate course theory with classroom experience?

"The effort to integrate classroom experience with coursework has been effective because instructors at the university have remained flexible. When assignments are given, the student can modify the assignment so the class benefits from the lesson as well. Without this flexibility the HIP aide would be doing unrelated work which would be something less than beneficial to her and to my class."

"In my opinion, of what I've seen of the effectiveness of course integration with the classroom experience, it has been tremendous. I feel that many of the ideas that the HIP aides are introduced to, they do bring back into the classroom and that they try to make them work for the students. I've seen fantastic organization on the part of the HIP aide that I've had. He's very good at analyzing a task and bringing it down to the level or up to the level of the child. I feel that this probably is to a great extent due to the training that he has had within the university and through his coursework because I feel that since he has had to experience this himself he has been able to bring it back to the child in the classroom."

APPENDIX D

I. Sample of Administrators Comments on Their Teachers who were HIP Graduates:

A. How does the teacher compare to the criteria you use when evaluating teachers?

1. Generally rates outstanding to superior on all ratings. She has a good chance to attain tenure eventually in the district.

2. Satisfactory.

3. Excellent.

4. In all areas, above average to strong.

5. Very favorably.

6. ... is an outstanding person and will be a master teacher after "seasoning". I appreciate the fine help she was given in her college preparation and I am most pleased to have her as a teacher.

7. Does very well.

B. How does this teacher compare to other teachers?

1. Favorably.

2. Comparable.

3. She compares very well.

4. He is superior to most first year teachers.

5. Her teaching techniques, personal qualities, and professional qualities are all outstanding.

6. ... is rated highly among beginning teachers and experienced teachers.

II. Sample Comments from Peer Teachers About HIP Graduates:

A. How does this teacher compare to other first year teachers?

1. She seems much more at ease and confident than first year teachers.

2. I believe she is doing an excellent job. She keeps up with everything--usually figures things out on her own--but does ask questions when necessary.

3. He is continually seeking answers to make sure he is covering all necessary material and he seeks advice from colleagues to help his teaching become even better.

4. ...seems to be more sure of herself as a teacher than most first year teachers.

5. Very favorably.

6. I would rate her as a superior first year teacher.

7. ...is the most outstanding first year teacher I have known.

8. Quite favorably.

B. What do you see as this teacher's major strength?

1. She seems at ease with her children.

2. Her enthusiasm, eagerness to put in work and time for those children who need her. She is very concerned about the children's needs (individual needs).

3. ...enjoys working for the full benefit of the child and he enjoys working with children. This enjoyment comes out in many everyday lessons.

4. Her enthusiasm for teaching.

5. Concern for children learning at their level, very cooperative with other teachers.

6. ...major strengths include her ability to individualize and meet the needs of each student, her rapport with students, and her enthusiastic approach to teaching.

7. ...concern for children and her ability to recognize learning problems and how to correct them, as well as her motivational ability for all students appear to be her major strengths.

8. She is always looking for new ideas and a different way of doing something.